Canadian Centre
For Foreign Policy
Development

Centre canadien
pour le développement
de la politique étrangère

[redacted]

125 promenade Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2
Telephone/Téléphone : **613 944 8278** Fax/Télécopieur : **613 944 0687**
www.cfp-pec.gc.ca

101-00749/

The State of Canada's Foreign Policy Research Capacity

ANNEX 2

THE STATE OF CANADA'S FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH CAPACITY

Summary Report

Prepared by The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs
Carleton University
Ottawa, Canada

Introduction

In order to assess the current research capacity in Canada and to inform and support the development of appropriate policies in these areas, the Policy Branch at the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) asked The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University, to provide an assessment of the state of Canada's foreign policy research capacity.

This report examines a number of questions related to the state of foreign policy expertise in Canada. It addresses such questions as: what is the capacity of policy research in Canada? What are the relative strengths and weaknesses of foreign policy research and analysis conducted outside government? What should government departments and external policy researchers do to make foreign policy research more relevant to the interests and needs of the policy-making community?

The following functional and geographic subject areas, which were chosen by DFAIT, are covered in this report:

- **Functional**

  environment, human rights and civil society, communications technology, migration and population, international trade and investment, international finance, international security, UN system and international institutions, international law, aid and development

- **Geographic**

  United States, Canada-U.S. relations, Latin America, Europe, Africa, Middle East, Asia-Pacific

Prominent figures in selected fields were identified and commissioned to write

brief discussion papers outlining the state of capacity in Canada in relation to their field encompassing its evolution and prospects; strengths and weaknesses in key policy areas; networks and infrastructure, including journals, professional associations, regular conferences; generational profile of expertise; and the extent to which their community engages not only in academic research but also policy-relevant work and analysis and its level of engagement on Canadian foreign policy issues.

The purpose of these discussion papers is to facilitate assessments about the breadth, depth, originality, relevance, and longer-term orientation of the work being done. Authors were asked to comment candidly on the financial resources and prospects of their areas, indicating whether it is over or under committed, funding sources, and what can be done to redress imbalances or deficiencies in a period of severely limited funds.

The data presented in the individual reports was gathered in a very short period of time. For the most part, the assessments are impressionistic and based on each individual's knowledge of relevant Canadian expertise in a given area. In some instances, information was also gathered through telephone interviews, Internet searches, university course calendars, and documentation from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, brochures from related research groups, and various publications. It should be stressed that the information provided in these reports is neither comprehensive nor systematic. There are scholars and other analysts whose work does not appear in these reports. That being said, viewed as whole, the reports support a number of clear, general conclusions about the overall state of Canada's foreign policy research capacity.

General Assessment of Areas of Strength and Weakness

On the basis of the information provided in the reports, it is possible to offer some general observations about the areas of greater strength and weakness in the research capacity of the Canadian scholarly and research community. This overview assessment is based on the following general criteria: the number of scholars/researchers working in a given area; the presence or absence of major university-based research centres that concentrate on a particular topic or region or undertake substantial work in a given area; the presence or absence of non-profit organizations which undertake significant programs of research and policy analysis; the presence or absence of government-funded organizations which support research and have in-house research capacity; and the presence or absence of research networks and consortia that exist on a regional or nation-wide basis. Strength is defined as existing in areas where the number of scholars and researchers is sizeable and approaches or exceeds 100, where major research centres exist that are generally well-funded and have a strong track record of publications and engagement in policy-relevant research, and where there are

professional networks and associations that allow scholars and researchers to gather and communicate in order to share knowledge and information.

In offering a general assessment of areas of strength and weakness in the Canadian scholarly and research community, it should be emphasized that not all areas defined as "strong" meet all of the above-mentioned criteria. But they do meet many of them, and therefore can be considered areas of strength, particularly from a comparative perspective. Readers are urged to consult the individual subject-area reports for a more detailed analysis of the strengths and weakness of research capacity in a given field.

Canada has considerable scholarly expertise in a wide range of subject-areas pertaining to foreign affairs and international trade, including the environment, migration and population, international trade and investment, international finance, international law, security studies, UN system and international institutions, aid and development, Canada-U.S. relations, Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, Russia and the former Soviet Union, and Asia-Pacific. Canadian universities have developed a pool of scholars and researchers who are doing first-class research, and many of these scholars are at the forefront of their fields internationally.

Some of these areas of scholarly expertise are relatively new and expanding. The Canadian research community focussing on Asia-Pacific, for example, is much larger than it was a decade ago, strengthened by new faculty appointments, and the "conversion" of many academics to Asia-Pacific issues. This community is also much better organized for policy research, principally because of the development of larger and more sophisticated university-based research centres. The research community focussing on the environment has also grown since the mid-1980s, reflected in a steep rise in the volume, depth and breadth of work. More established research communities also contribute heavily to the existing Canadian scholarly expertise. Canada benefits from a wealth of research in migration, refugee and population issues as a result of having major, university-based research centres that have developed an international reputation for the high quality of their research. The security studies research community is another area of considerable research expertise, nurtured by a program of research grants under the auspices of the Security and Defence Forum (formerly the Military and Strategic Studies Program). Although far from an exhaustive listing, these examples of research expertise suggest the dynamism of the Canadian research community.

It is also important to underscore that this foreign policy research expertise continues to be concentrated largely in universities and university-based research centres. There are, of course, notable exceptions to this. The North-South Institute, the Canadian Foundation for the Americas (FOCAL), and the

International Development Research Centre produce high quality independent research, and engage heavily in research-related activities. Other foreign policy "think tanks" funded by government, such as the Montreal-based International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, have concentrated their efforts more on advocacy rather than on long-term research projects.

Much of this research expertise developed in Canada appears to have some policy relevance, although there is no consistent or shared definition as to what constitutes "policy relevant" work. However, there are some areas of weakness where Canada's scholarly research capacity on policy matters is limited, in particular, on human rights, communications technology, the United States, and Europe.

It may come as somewhat of surprise that Canada's research capacity in human rights and civil society is deemed weak. This is because the main research interest of Canadian scholars has been to examine the relationship between principles and practice in Canadian human rights foreign policy and the role of aid and trade sanctions to defend/protect human rights violations in aid recipient countries. It is only relatively recently that issues of transitional justice and the problems of advancing human rights in societies that are moving towards democracy have begun to receive attention in both policy-making and research circles. Some think-tanks such as the North-South Institute, Institute on Governance, and the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development have carried out research for the government on human rights programming in selected countries and/or undertaken special studies on democratic development in some countries and regions. Although thematic expertise on human rights exists in Canada's major universities, there is only one specialized university centre engaged exclusively in human rights research in the country.

Communications technology is another area where there is a significant gap in scholarship and research, particularly in the technology/international relations/foreign policy nexus. There are practically no academics or researchers in the country who consider their primary research and expertise to fall in this area, although there is a fairly wide range of scholars who deal generally with communications technology and foreign policy. Nor is there a dedicated research institution or research network that focuses exclusively on communications technology and foreign policy/international relations. Part of the reason for this gap is that funding sources in this area are limited and largely limited to the public sector. The other main reason is that the policy issues brought on by rapid advances in communications technology in recent years are enormously complex and are only just beginning to be understood.

Research on the United States in Canada is functionally rather than regionally

based. Scholars have a great deal of familiarity with particular issues in Canada-U.S. relations, e.g., trade and defence policy, but the degree and level of familiarity with domestic U.S. institutions and politics is limited. There are no formal groups engaged primarily in policy research concerning the United States, although there are a number of American studies groups that include a policy component to their activities. The scholarly community of U.S.-oriented policy research is amorphous and ill-defined, and it is difficult to identify scholars who are engaged primarily in U.S. policy research. Part of the reason for this weakness is that Canadians tend to take the United States for granted because Canada is inundated with American news, entertainment, and other cultural products. There is also some evidence to suggest that there is a decline in policy-relevant research and publications on Canada-U.S. relations as well, even though this is an area of traditional strength in scholarly research.

Research capacity on Europe in Canada is also limited with an under-representation of policy specialists and experts on economic, business, and trade matters pertaining to the European Union. The research community on Europe tends to be dominated by political scientists specializing in comparative politics, security, and international relations. There are a number of university-based research centres concentrating on Europe, some of which receive support from outside of Canada, as well as non-profit organizations which are not university-based, but overall Canadian academic interest in Europe has declined over the past 25 years. The recent establishment of the new European Community Studies Association in Canada may deepen the well of scholars and researchers working on Europe.

The general areas of strength and weakness in scholarly capacity are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

General Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses in the Scholarly & Research Community

Strong	Weak
Environment	Human rights & civil society
Migration & population	Communications technology
International trade & investment	United States
International finance	Europe
International law	

International security	
UN system & international institutions	
Aid & development	
Canada-U.S. relations	
Latin America	
Africa	
Middle East	
Russia & former Soviet Union	
Asia-Pacific	

Depth and Breadth of Existing Scholarly & Research Capacity

Assessing the breadth and depth of existing scholarly and research capacity in Canada is a highly subjective exercise because qualitative judgments are involved, and each scholar's assessment of the field is likely to vary according to his/her own familiarity with the work of his/her colleagues. It is also difficult to estimate the number of senior researchers working in a given area by simply looking at memberships in professional associations, because there are large numbers of graduate students who are just beginning their professional careers. That being said, some of the commentaries suggest that the depth and breadth of scholarly expertise in a given area is limited because the number of senior researchers working in an area is small and work is confined to a few core subject areas, because centres of expertise have narrowly defined research programs, and/or because well-funded, research centres simply do not exist.

Areas of depth and breadth in scholarly and policy-related research include the environment, migration and population, international trade and investment, international law, international institutions, aid and development, Latin America, Africa, Middle East, and Asia-Pacific (see Table 2). Research capacity in some areas is growing as issues like environmental security attract research funds and scholarly attention, or academics "convert" themselves to the study of regions of growing economic and political importance like Asia-Pacific.

Scholarly research in the areas of human rights and civil society, communications technology, United States, and Europe tends to be narrow for the reasons discussed above. It may come as somewhat of a surprise to find that the commentators on international finance, Canada-U.S. relations, and Russia and

the former Soviet Union also feel that scholarly expertise in their fields is narrowly focused or lacking in breadth.

The demise of the Economic Council of Canada partly accounts for weakness in policy-relevant research in the area of international finance. During its existence, the Economic Council of Canada carried out major research on issues of international finance, including the implications of the globalization of financial services for Canada. Although there is a small pool of researchers doing high quality research on international financial institutions in Canada, the bulk of this work is centred on North America and Europe and is weak on international financial matters pertaining to developing economies and the Asia-Pacific region. The corporate side of international finance has also not received the attention it deserves.

In Canada-U.S. relations, the dominant focus of published research and scholarly inquiry is on economic relations. Other areas, such as defence, Arctic sovereignty, science, and technology, have received some attention. However, issues like culture have received scant attention as have comparative public policy responses to common issues and problems which may be an important, emerging area of study. There is also a marked decline in funded research and publications on the Canada-U.S. relationship in recent years, although there has been a shift in research focus to Canada's broader involvement in North American and hemispheric affairs. Although the number of scholars in Canada with scholarly interest in Russia, the former Soviet Union, and Central Europe is quite large, much of the research is carried out by those with interest in the historical, literary, and linguistic aspects of these regions. In contrast, the pool of researchers working on current policy issues is small even though it contains scholars who are deemed to be doing first-class work by world standards. The demise of the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security (CIIPS), which was an important source of funding and an initiator of policy-relevant research, also explains part of this decline. Although there is considerable research strength on Russia and Ukraine, expertise on Asia and Central Europe is small or diminishing as older scholars retire and are not replaced because of cutbacks in academic positions.

TABLE 2

Depth and Breadth of Scholarly & Research Capacity

Broad	Narrow
Environment	Human rights & civil society
Migration & population	Communications technology

International trade & investment	International finance
International law	United States
International security	Canada-U.S. relations
UN system & international institutions	Europe
Aid & development	Russia & former Soviet Union
Latin America	
Africa	
Middle East	
Asia-Pacific	

Size of Pool of Scholars & Researchers

In some areas, there appears to be a direct correlation between the size of the pool of scholars and researchers working in a given area and the breadth, depth, and quality of scholarly research, whereas in others there appears to be no correlation at all. For example, although the commentators for the papers on the UN system and international institutions and international law noted that the number of active scholars engaged in research in their field is small, the quality and breadth of policy-relevant research being carried out is generally quite high. The same appears to be true of Canada's regional expertise on the Middle East, Russia, and the former Soviet Union. The pool of researchers in areas such as the environment, migration and population, international trade and investment, aid and development, Latin America, Africa, and Asia-Pacific is large, as is the breadth and depth of expertise on a wide range of issues and topics (see Table 3). In these fields, Canadian scholarship is also vibrant and at the cutting-edge of research. Many Canadian scholars and researchers have acquired international reputations for their work in these fields.

TABLE 3

Size of Pool of Scholars & Researchers

Large	Small
Environment	Human rights & civil society
Migration & population	Communications technology

International trade & investment	International finance
International security	UN system & international institutions
Aid & development	International law
Latin America	United States
Africa	Canada-U.S. relations
Asia-Pacific	Europe
	Middle East
	Russia & former Soviet Union

Canadian Policy Orientation of Scholarship and Research

Generally speaking, most of the commentators felt that the research being carried out in their respective fields and areas of expertise had a strong policy orientation. However, many felt that this policy-oriented research capacity was not being effectively harnessed or utilized by the policy community. The absence of formal and informal institutional links which facilitate communication and consultation between the academic and policy community was cited as the principle reason for this problem. In addition, several commentators felt that the Canadian policy orientation in their field was weak because funding from Canadian sources was limited or non-existent. Areas where commentators noted the lack of a distinctly Canadian focus in the work being done include communications technology, international law, international finance, United States, Europe, Middle East, and Russia and the former Soviet Union (see Table 4). In contrast, in areas where there is a relatively strong Canadian orientation to the research being carried by individual researchers and/or institutions of research, this is due to the fact that research is being sponsored by the Canadian government or other Canadian-based, private sources of funding. Many of the commentators noted that foundations outside of Canada are generally not interested in supporting research that has a Canadian orientation or focus.

TABLE 4

Canadian Policy Orientation of Scholarship & Research

Strong	Weak
Environment	Communications technology
Human rights & civil society	International finance

Migration & population	International law
International trade & investment	United States
International security	Europe
UN system & international organizations	Middle East
Aid & development	Russia & former Soviet Union
Canada-U.S. relations	
Latin America	
Africa	
Asia-Pacific	

Existing Networks & Infrastructure

There is a rich network of scholarly professional associations, learned societies, and other forms of outreach in many of the fields and subject areas covered by this study. In addition, many universities house research centres and institutes which carry out policy-relevant research (see Table 5). These centres are dispersed across the country, although the greatest areas of strength and concentration are based in Canada's major metropolitan centres: Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec City, and Halifax. There are very few fields where a single, national, comprehensive research institution exists. Possible exceptions include the Centre for Population Research at the Université de Montréal and the Centre for Refugee Studies at York University, both of which have been the recipients of major grants from the federal government and are internationally renown centres of excellence.

In many research areas, however, the Canadian scholarly community is characterized by some degree of fragmentation. There are many sources of this: historic, disciplinary, ideological, regional, and personal. In addition, there remains an element of the "two solitudes" between scholars and researchers in Quebec and the rest of Canada. This "divide" appears somewhat more significant in functional rather than regional or geographical areas of research specialization, in part because of better established national or international networks bringing together regional specialists. Again, there are notable exceptions: the security studies community across Canada, for example, has become better integrated under the programs of the Security and Defence Forum.

The problem of "two solitudes" also extends to relationships between the

academic, NGO, and government communities where contacts are limited and sporadic, and there are few opportunities for interaction and sustained dialogue and discussion on major policy issues. Although considerable sums are spent on research, conferences, and network building at the professional level, surprisingly little is directed at discussion about Canadian policy options and how international developments affect Canadian interests. The government-sponsored Foreign Policy Review process is an exception, of course.

TABLE 5

Strength of Existing Networks and Infrastructure

Strong	Weak
Migration & population	Environment
International trade & investment	Human rights & civil society
International security	Communications technology
UN system & international organizations	International finance
International law	United States
Aid & development	Canada-U.S. relations
Latin America	Europe
Africa	
Middle East	
Russia & former Soviet Union	
Asia-Pacific	

Rise/Decline in Scholarly Capacity in Recent Years

It is disheartening that virtually every commentator felt that the future is bleak and that the scholarly and research capacity in his/her field is eroding due to the growing lack of funds for research, lack of job opportunities for new scholars because of cutbacks in academic positions, and few opportunities outside of academe for younger scholars and recently minted Ph.Ds to carry out research or find employment until academic positions become available. Although there is a strong cohort of scholars engaged in teaching and research who are in their forties and fifties, there is not an equivalent pool of scholars in their late twenties

and thirties who are coming up through the ranks because new hiring at many universities, with some exceptions, has been frozen for the past several years. Although a limited number of postdoctoral fellowships are available through the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and programs like the Security and Defence Forum of the Department of National Defence, these resources are not sufficient to nurture and sustain the next generation of scholars and researchers, many of whom are being forced to find employment outside of Canada and in the non-academic job market. In some areas, new sources of funding as well as the demand for teachers have expanded the pool of research talent in recent years. In others, a lack of resources coupled with the retirement of older scholars has shrunk the research base. The results of the survey are summarized in Table 6 below.

TABLE 6

Rise and Decline of Scholarly & Research Capacity by Field

Rise	Decline	No Appreciable Change
Environment	International law	Communications technology
Population & migration	Aid & development	UN system & international organizations
International trade & investment	Human rights & civil society	United States
International finance	Canada-U.S. relations	Middle East
Latin America	Africa	International security
Europe	Russia & former Soviet Union	
Asia-Pacific		

Availability of Financial Resources to Support Policy-Oriented Research

There are very few areas where the resources available to support policy-oriented research in Canadian universities and think-tanks is not shrinking (see Table 7). In virtually all fields, competition for increasingly scarce resources is growing. The principal source of funds for research has been the federal government through its various granting agencies like the Social Sciences and

Humanities Research Council, the former Cooperative Security Fund of Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade which replaced CIIPS, and individual agencies and departments like CIDA. Federal cutbacks to research funds have taken their toll on these granting agencies as have the recent round of provincial cutbacks to education. Some private foundations in Canada, like the Donner Foundation, have supported research in particular areas, like Canada-U.S. relations, but their support has waned in recent years. Others, like the Gordon Foundation, have provided modest resources for foreign policy related activities and research in clearly defined areas (e.g., the Arctic). Canadian scholars are increasingly being forced to tap outside sources like the Ford Foundation, MacArthur Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, United States Institute of Peace, and Pew Charitable Trusts. Many have been successful in acquiring resources to support their research in highly competitive international competitions, but the price is diminished research capacity and expertise on Canada. The growing "internationalization" of Canada's research capacity may augment the profile of those academics who are successful in obtaining support from external sources, but the price, in the long run, is likely to be diminished expertise on policy matters that are of direct relevance and importance to Canadian interests.

TABLE 7

Availability of Funding for Scholarship & Research

Declining	Rising	No Change/Hard to Say
Environment	International law	Migration & population
Human rights & civil society	Asia-Pacific	International trade & investment
Communications technology		International finance
International security		Europe
UN system & international organizations		
Aid & development		
United States		
Canada-U.S. relations		
Latin America		

Middle East		
Russia & former Soviet Union		

Recommendations for Strengthening Canadian Policy Research Capacity and Linkages with the Policy Community

All of the subject reports contain recommendations for strengthening Canadian research capacity and linkages with the policy community in their respective, individual fields. Many of these recommendations will be of special interest to those working in these fields, in both the policy and academic communities. However, there are a number of general recommendations which are useful in advancing discussion about ways to strengthen Canada's policy research capacity and develop closer linkages between academics/researchers and public officials. Together they point to the need to strengthen networks and linkages between the government and those engaged in policy-oriented research in the academic and NGO communities; to expose young scholars and researchers to the policy world through internships and fellowships in DFAIT and other government agencies and departments; to concentrate funding in core areas rather than dissipating resources because policy research priorities are not well defined; and to channel resources through existing institutions and centres of excellence rather than creating new ones.

These following general recommendations are offered in the various individual reports.

Recommendations Regarding Research Capacity in Canada

Although the research community in Canada is generally strong, it faces significant challenges which must be addressed. In particular, attention must be given to renewing areas of research strength in the context of diminishing resources and lack of employment opportunities in Canadian universities and research organizations. Resources which do exist must therefore be carefully targeted. In addition, the Canadian research and scholarly community must work harder to strengthen networks between universities and NGOs, and within the university community, between its own members across disciplines and regional divides.

It is equally important to recognize that the Canadian scholarly and research community is more complex than division into regional and functional categories of expertise would suggest. Many, if not most, researchers in Canada possess both regional and functional knowledge, which often makes it difficult to

identify the members of a specific research community. While this is particularly evident in the case of research on the United States, it does suggest that there is a need to develop a more comprehensive inventory of scholars in Canada and their research expertise.

- foreign policy increasingly encompasses a range of new issues that must be built into academic research priorities, including the environment, refugees, democratization, ethnicity, human rights, societal reconstruction, and peace-building

- the absence of major research centres in some fields has hindered the development of a cadre of specialists with extensive policy expertise; where major research centres do exist, policy expertise is considerable and Canada is a leader in the field

- too much money has been spent on conferences in some fields rather than on supporting projects and policy relevant research that develops options for Canadian policy

- Canadian research capacity is likely to diminish rapidly in some areas because of the lack of employment opportunities in universities for new scholars and constraints on funding for research (these areas include e.g., Africa, aid & development, Canada-U.S. relations)

- senior researchers tend to be overcommitted and cannot meet the demand for contract research and international meetings; a coterie of younger researchers needs to be developed through post-doctoral programs

- there are some disturbing gaps in Canada's research capacity, particularly with regard to U.S. domestic policy

- new institutional capacity should only be created when a clear need arises and research funding should be targeted towards those most directly involved in policy-oriented research (e.g., universities and think-tanks)

- networks and linkages among researchers with different disciplinary backgrounds (e.g, science, law, economics, and political science), between scholars in Quebec and the rest of Canada, and between NGO and academic communities should be strengthened

Recommendations Regarding the Relationship between the Canadian Scholarly and Research Community and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade

These recommendations underscore the willingness of the Canadian research community to develop a closer interchange with DFAIT. The challenge is to find a model for exchange which would serve the interests of both the scholarly and policy communities. In this regard, it would be useful to survey the models developed in other countries, some of which have been more successful than others in integrating the policy-relevant research of their respective scholarly communities. The case of Australia, where members of the research community have been integrated for short periods into operational policy roles, might be a promising example to investigate further.

- there is a growing need to "bridge the gap" between the academic and policy audience (e.g., international finance, environment and trade) where the issues are technical and complex

- in some areas (e.g, Russia & former Soviet Union) those doing policy-relevant work are under-utilized by DFAIT even though an issue/region may command considerable resources within the Department

- there is a growing group of younger Canadian scholars with functional expertise in areas like peace-building, environmental security, and regional and multilateral institutions who are doing important policy-related, comparative work, but because these scholars do not have strong links with traditional area specialists, their expertise is under utilized by existing research and policy networks

- there are complaints about "clientilism" in the relationship between the DFAIT, CIDA, and some academics/researchers. This atmosphere can and should be cleaned up with a systematic analysis of the programs in question, and some recognition of regional access and equity if indeed these widespread concerns or myths can be substantiated.

- first-class policy-oriented research can only take place in an environment in which there is extensive, ongoing contact between the researcher and the government client

- if Canada is to develop a cadre of experts engaged in policy-oriented research that is useful to government, it will have to create opportunities which allow academics to spend time in government in positions where they can acquire first-hand knowledge about policy-making (policy fellowship programs in Australia and the United States may serve as useful models)

- use the Internet to strengthen academic/policy linkages and communications

Recommendations Regarding Public and Private Funding of Research

The Canadian research community has traditionally been very dependent on public funding to support its research. In the context of diminishing resources, many research strengths may be threatened, and new research and pressing competencies are less likely to be developed. New thinking has to be done with regard to funding models in order to ensure the development and maintenance of a vibrant research community. While many Canadian scholars have been able to secure alternate sources of research funding (much of it foreign-based), such funding has serious consequences for the development of Canadian policy-relevant research. This is because non-Canadian funders are rarely interested in funding research on Canada. The need to search for foreign sources of research funding also underscores the lack of private sector involvement in research funding in Canada.

- there is an urgent need to encourage business and private foundations to support policy-oriented research (particularly in those regions where Canada's economic interests are growing such as Asia-Pacific and Latin America) as government funding sources disappear or diminish

- there is a need to develop collaborative, parallel research projects in multi-national research ventures on foreign policy problems of mutual concern

- American and non-Canadian funding sources will not support work on Canadian policy priorities or support scholars to develop the implications of their work for Canadian policy

- the Department of National Defence (DND) has developed an extensive community of academics and specialists working on defence and security policy issues through its Military and Strategic Studies Program (recently renamed the Security and Defence Forum) which awards five-year grants on a competitive basis to selected universities across Canada

Assessment of Canadian Foreign Policy Research Capacity

Topic	Analyst
Environment	John Kirton (UFT)
Human Rights and Civil Society	David Gillies (Aga Khan Foundation)
Communications Technology	Ron Diebert (UBC)
Migration and Population	Howard Adelman (York)
International Trade & Investment	Robert Howse (UFT)
International Finance	William Coleman (McMaster)
International Security & Peacekeeping	Albert Legault (Laval)
UN System and International Institutions	Tom Keating (U. of Alberta)
International Law	Armand de Mestral (McGill)
Aid and Development	Roy Culpeper (North-South Institute)
The United States	David Leyton-Brown (York)
Canada-US Relations	Donald Barry (U. of Calgary)
Latin America	Ed Dosman (York)
Europe	Evan Potter (*Canadian Foreign Policy*)
Africa	Tim Shaw (Dalhousie)
The Middle East	Rex Brynen (McGill)
Asia-Pacific	Paul Evans
Russia & the former Soviet Union	Paul Marantz (UBC)